DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 727 IR 050 366

AUTHOR Skinner, Pamela A.; And Others
TITLE Minimum Educational Requirements for Appointment to University Librarian Ranks at the University of Connecticut Libraries. Report of the Advisory Council on Evaluation and Promotion.
INSTITUTION Connecticut Univ., Storrs.
PUB DATE Dec 82
NOTE 49p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Advisory Committees; *College Libraries; *Employment Qualifications; Higher Education; Information Science; *Librarians; *Library Education; Literature Reviews; *Masters Degrees; Policy Formation; Position Papers; Professional Education
IDENTIFIERS Archivists; *University of Connecticut; Want Ads

ABSTRACT

As a result of requests from the University Librarian and the University Archivist at the University of Connecticut, the Advisory Council on Evaluation and Promotion (ACEP)--composed entirely of University of Connecticut librarians--considered the issue of minimum educational requirements for appointment to or promotion within the University Librarian ranks, with special focus on the requirement for a Master of Library Science (MLS) degree. This report summarizes the results of the Council's actions, covering: (1) background material; (2) a review of the literature concerning library education and training; (3) a survey of job advertisements for professional librarian positions with selected telephone follow-up to determine what practices are followed at other institutions; (4) the views of the American Library Association (ALA); (5) a summary of a Council meeting with the University Archivist to discuss the issue; (6) a summary of written comments on the issue by University of Connecticut librarians; and (7) a summary of an ACEP general meeting on the issue. Recommendations resulting from these actions are also presented, with the major recommendation stating that the MLS requirement should be retained. A 53-item bibliography and appendices reproducing related memoranda, letters, and meeting agendas conclude the report. (ESR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED233727

MINIMUM EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR APPOINTMENT TO UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN RANKS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT LIBRARIES

Report
of the
Advisory Council on Evaluation and Promotion

Pamela A. Skinner, Chair
Marie L. Clark
Constance B. Cooke
Ellen E. Embardo
David F. Garnes
Judith A. Lahey
Thornton P. McGlamery
Carmel T. O'Neill
Robert D. Vrecenak

IR 050 366

Storrs, Connecticut
December 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Pamela A. Skinner
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. BACKGROUND 1

II. LITERATURE REVIEW 5

III. SURVEY OF ADVERTISEMENTS OF PROFESSIONAL LIBRARIAN POSITIONS WITH RESPECT TO MLS REQUIREMENTS 10

IV. THE ISSUE AS ADDRESSED BY THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION 15

V. SUMMARY OF THE MEETING WITH THE UNIVERSITY ARCHIVIST 18

VI. SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS FROM UNIVERSITY LIBRARIANS 22

VII. SUMMARY OF THE ALL-LIBRARIAN MEETING 25

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION 28

A. Recommendations 28

B. Narrative 28

C. Conclusion 33

BIBLIOGRAPHY i

APPENDICES .....

A. The University Archivist's Memorandum of February 26, 1982 v

B. The University Librarian's Letter of March 17, 1982 vi

C. Agenda of the April 13, 1982 Annual All-Librarian ACEP Meeting viii

D. Advisory Council Letter to the University Librarian, May 18, 1982 ... ix

E. Advisory Council Memorandum to University Librarians re: July 28, 1982 open meeting x

F. Advisory Council Memorandum to University Librarians re: rescheduling of the open meeting to August 25, 1982 xii

G. The University Librarian's Memorandum of September 8, 1982 defining the University Library Specialist Category xiii

I. BACKGROUND

In 1980-81, the University Librarian first requested the Advisory Council on Evaluation and Promotion (ACEP) to address the issue of whether individuals without a master's degree in library science[1] could, for specialized positions, be appointed to the University Librarian ranks. This request was made verbally. The Council's subsequent reply was also made verbally and relied entirely on the Criteria for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion (Professional Librarians), which states, "The minimum educational requirement for appointment to the librarian ranks is the completion of an accredited graduate program in librarianship or information science."

The issue resurfaced during the Council's 1981-82 term as a result of a February 26, 1982 memorandum from the University Archivist to the University Librarian, a copy of which was sent to the Advisory Council (Appendix A). In this memorandum, the University Archivist requested that "the minimum educational requirement for the rank of University Librarian I in Historical Manuscripts & Archives be set as 'completion of an accredited graduate program in History, American Studies, or Archival Administration.'" The memorandum also contained the request that the Advisory Council on Evaluation and Promotion give the MLS requirement a full review.

As a first response to the University Archivist's memorandum, several members of the Advisory council met with the University Librarian on March 16, 1982 to discuss the memorandum and to seek clarification of the issue of "equivalent" degrees and the Council's involvement in the issue. The one tangible outcome of the meeting was a commitment on the part of the

---

[1] The master's of library science degree and its variant designations will hereafter be referred to as the MLS.

University Librarian to clarify, in writing, the scope of the issue as he viewed it. This clarification came in a letter of March 17, 1982 (Appendix B).

The basic thrust of this letter is illustrated by the following excerpt:

> Specifically the question is whether or not there are, or may be, positions within the University Libraries whose duties and responsibilities are such that they are in accord with the qualities desired in librarians of all ranks and those specifically delineated for the various ranks, beginning with that of University Librarian I, but for which other educational qualifications might be substituted for the present minimum educational requirement of completion of an accredited graduate program in librarianship or information science.

The letter also posed seven specific questions, most of which relate to identifying specific positions or departments in which an equivalent degree might be appropriate or identifying the "admissible" degrees or specialized training to the exclusion of all others. In addition, a question was raised concerning the possibility that the pool of applicants for certain positions might be unduly restricted if an MLS is required in addition to a subject master's or other specialized training.

On March 30, 1982, several members of the Advisory Council met with the Associate Director for Personnel in order to clarify further the issues raised by the University Librarian and to discuss alternative solutions to the problems raised in his letter of March 17. A considerable portion of the meeting was devoted to a discussion of the job classification study that the University is currently conducting and the possible bearing it may have on the issue of minimum educational requirements for positions. There was also some discussion of the American Library Association's interest in the issue of these requirements. Lastly, the Associate Director shared with the Advisory Council members the results of the telephone survey she was conducting

to determine the educational requirements of other academic libraries for entry level librarian ranks.

By mid-Spring 1982, the Advisory Council members had not only participated in the meetings mentioned above, but were in the midst of a thorough literature search on the issue of educational qualifications and classification of specialists in academic libraries. As the Advisory Council read and discussed the available literature, it became increasingly clear that the issue of minimum educational requirements and of equivalent degrees was an extremely complex and hotly debated one. The question then arose whether the Advisory Council--whose main function it is to review and make recommendations regarding promotional cases--was the proper group to deal with the issues the University Archivist and University Librarian had raised; might it not be more appropriate and efficient to establish a personnel advisory committee to deal with this issue and perhaps other similar issues in the future? The Council, after much discussion, decided to make this question an agenda item at the annual all-librarian ACEP meeting on April 13, 1982 (Appendix C). At this meeting, it was decided by all the librarians present--and underscored by the University Librarian--that the Advisory Council on Evaluation and Promotion had the jurisdiction to deal with this issue and should do so.

Since there was insufficient time between the April 13 meeting and the end of the 1981-82 ACEP term on May 31, 1982 to consider fully and responsibly the issues raised by the University Librarian, the 1981-82 Council charged the 1982-83 Council to do so. The University Librarian was informed of this action on May 18, 1982 (see Appendix D). At the same time, the 1981-82 Council determined a course of action to be followed during the summer: 1) the literature search should be continued;

2) a survey of job advertisements would be conducted with selected telephone follow-up to determine what practices other institutions follow in hiring specialists and fitting them into their personnel structures; 3) a meeting of the Advisory Council with the University Archivist would be held in order to honor his request for the opportunity to argue the merits of his request; 4) written comments would be solicited from all librarians in the University of Connecticut Libraries to determine their views on altering the minimum educational requirement for appointment to the University Librarian ranks; and 5) an all-librarian meeting would be convened during the summer in order to discuss the issue and to allow opportunity for further input by librarians.

Section II-VII of this report are devoted to summarizing the results of the above activities. Section VIII consists of the Advisory Council's recommendations and response regarding the issues raised by the University Librarian.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

In reviewing the minimum educational requirement for appointment to the University Librarian ranks, the Advisory Council consulted literature concerning the nature of librarianship and library positions, training for librarianship, credentials for beginning librarians, educational advancement within an individual's career, the role of library schools in training librarians, and professionalism in librarianship. In addition, the Council researched alternative career ladders for non-MLS library employees, training for archivists, library-archive relations, the role of specialists in academic libraries, and the training of specialists.

Much of the literature reflects an unresolved identity problem among librarians themselves. The role of librarians within an institution, within the profession, and within society is anything but clear. Swan[2] sees librarians as educators, engaged in teaching, interpretation of ideas, and intellectual relationships with patrons. Toy views librarians as professionals who develop the core of knowledge necessary for the practice of a "true" profession; such knowledge is expanded through research efforts of individual librarians, particularly those in academic libraries. Other librarians, however (e.g., Nelson), feel that the pursuit of the "chimera" of professionalism is futile, largely because of the widespread view that librarianship is characterized by routine, technical work. Finally, the whole question of who we are and what we do is often, as Bayless notes, muddled by a preponderance of individuals who view themselves as "wishy-washy" and unable to define themselves within a strong vision of the profession of librarianship and who manifest a failure of nerve in defending the profession as being worthwhile. In answer to those who denigrate librarianship as simply a "trade" (e.g., Isaacson) with no intellectual

---

[2]See Bibliography for complete citations to this and following items.

content, one author (Dollard) proposes that we "burst out of the slammer of self-sacrificing shushing we've been sentenced to," recognize our chosen occupation for the valuable and worthwhile activity it is, and compensate its practitioners accordingly.[3]

Amidst such uncertainty and discord in the profession, future librarians are trained by library schools which provide a fairly standardized core curriculum of knowledge and techniques necessary for all librarians: acquisition of library materials, classification of these materials, reference sources, administration of libraries, and history of libraries and library materials. Library schools additionally provide a plethora of electives relevant to the many specialties within the profession. The question of whether library school training, and hence the MLS, is sufficient for all professional librarian positions, or worse, even relevant to actual tasks or functions of librarians, is central to the question of educational requirements for librarians.

Those questioning the necessity of an MLS for a librarian's work often cite a 1977-78 study entitled Library Selection Project. This study attempts to prove that the MLS as an absolute requirement for beginning librarians is not in accord with Equal Employment Opportunity guidelines. Using functional job analysis as a study tool, a committee of California librarians and selection specialists identified thirty-six tasks that a beginning librarian must be able to perform on "Day One" of employment. This study proves that the library schools surveyed adequately train librarians to perform these

---

[3]The professional organization representing the library profession--the American Library Association--has itself been criticized for failing to serve as an advocate for librarians and their concerns (Hogdin). This failure has led to the establishment of the National Librarians Association, an advocacy group working for the improvement of the conditions of employment for individual librarians, whom they define as those holding the MLS degree.

tasks; the study also concludes that non-MLS training programs and on-the-job experience provide sufficient background for the performance of the thirty-six tasks.

Keith Cottam ("Minimum Qualifications and the Law . . ."), reporting on the work of ALA's Minimum Qualifications for Librarians Task Force, writes that the Task Force recognizes the MLS as a worthy professional standard, but recommends that relevant knowledge, skills, and abilities possessed by the candidate be the focal point in the hiring process. Lawsuits reported in American Libraries and commentary elsewhere in the literature suggest that training and experience are more justifiable than the MLS alone in hiring librarians; while the MLS has been struck down by some civil service boards (Ohio) as a minimum educational requirement for librarians, in other cases (Jacksonville, Florida) it has been upheld as justifiable (American Library Association, Minimum Qualifications for Librarians . . .). Thus far, there has been only one court challenge regarding an MLS requirement in academic institutions, and this case is still pending ("Library Lawsuit. . ."). One cannot ignore the fact, though, that the federal government has recently made recommendations to eliminate the MLS as an absolute requirement for employment as a federal librarian ("Downgrading of Federal Librarians' Jobs Feared").

A move to restructure positions and titles to reflect the actual tasks performed affects professionals (see "Position Classification at Michigan . . ." and Library Selection Project. . .), paraprofessionals (see MacCampbell), and specialists within large research libraries (see Cottam's "Professional Specialists in Academic Libraries"). Cottam, especially, sees a growing need for the placement of highly trained, non-MLS employees in primarily administrative posts, such as budget, planning, conservation, personnel, facilities, and other specialist positions.

Advocates of "alternative" career ladders for library personnel do not negate that education beyond on-the-job training is necessary for the proper performance of librarians' work, but in general they do not identify precisely what form this education should take, nor do they often identify other ways to attain knowledge of library work. On-the-job training is seen as one avenue towards becoming a "good librarian" (see Daniels). Nowhere in Daniel's article, however, is it made clear who will conduct the training. On the other hand, advocates of certification recommend a series of continuing education workshops and tests as proof of competency throughout a librarian's career. Most certification advocates, however (Boaz, Burr, Regan), start from the premise that the MLS is the basic initial educational requirement: subsequent education and testing are simply methods of guaranteed continued competence in existing librarians. Hence, certification for most advocates does not provide an alternative path towards librarianship.

In terms of training specialists, most of the literature decries the paucity of opportunities within the standard MLS program for specialized training. Music librarians (see Ochs, Weichlein, "Notes for Notes," and "Qualifications of a Music Librarian . . .") have done much to define specifically what needs to be learned over and above the basics taught in library school. Rare book librarians (see McCrank's Education for Rare Book Librarianship) look to those few programs (Columbia, UCLA, University of Maryland) which offer advanced training within the library school curriculum. Some authors (McCrank, Peace) who see a connection between library and archival training look to cooperation between library science and history departments in training archivists. Most articles dealing with the training of specialists advocate extending library school training from one to two years; most view internships or other hands-on experience as essential during such training.

More must be said about the literature concerning archivists. While music librarians, rare book librarians, medical librarians, etc., find that library school training leaves much to be desired in its current state, they nonetheless seek to improve matters within the schools themselves, and at the same time establish their own guidelines for certification and/or non-library school training. Essentially, these specialists still view themselves as librarians. Archivists, on the other hand, generally prefer to remain separate, defining their own training programs within the boundaries of a separate profession. Librarians, they feel, do not do the same things archivists do and are seen as posing a threat to the uniqueness of the archivists' profession by attempting to define similarities between the two professions, hence, dominating the training of archivists. One strong impression portrayed in the literature surveyed is one of accusations on the part of both librarians and archivists of not understanding each other. A few individuals, generally those with experience in both archives and libraries, regret the rift and define the similarities between the two fields as striking.

Within the many articles and booklets surveyed, the most salient trend seems to be a concerted attack on the relevance of the MLS to the realities of library work. Only some rumblings of defense have surfaced, claiming that, lest librarians heed the "call to arms" and speak to their own sense of worth as a profession, then others will fill the void created by their lack of strong self-definition.

III. SURVEY OF ADVERTISEMENTS OF PROFESSIONAL LIBRARIAN POSITIONS WITH RESPECT TO MLS REQUIREMENTS

During the summer of 1982, members of the Advisory Council scanned job advertisements appearing in a two-month period in College & Research Library News, American Libraries, and the Chronicle of Higher Education for specialist positions in institutions comparable to the University of Connecticut Library. Nine libraries[4] were then contacted by telephone to determine policies and practices utilized in filling specialist positions as well as general personnel policies relevant to the MLS requirement. It must be noted that many advertisements requiring the MLS "or equivalent" turned out to mean the MLS or one of its variant designations (MSIS, MSLS, foreign library degrees, etc.), and not the MLS or other non-library graduate degrees. Most people contacted were asked the following questions, or appropriate variants thereof:

1. Is the MLS required for all librarian and/or specialist positions?

2. Do librarians and/or specialists have faculty status; If so, how does such status affect required minimum educational qualifications?

3. If a specialist were hired without the MLS, into what rank or ranking system would the person be placed?

4. Was the pool of applicants responding to the specific job advertisement restricted by requiring the MLS or (where applicable) other specialized training?

Specific situations at some institutions eliminated the need to ask all of the above questions. In other cases, the basic set of questions precipitated a lengthy discussion of other relevant issues.

Responses to question 1--whether the MLS is an absolute requirement

---

[4] Kansas State University, Louisiana State University, Northwestern University, Seton Hall University, University of Arizona, University of Arkansas, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, University of Kansas, and University of Virginia.

for appointment to the rank of librarian--were generally a qualified yes; some institutions make specific provisions for specialists. A summary of specific responses follows:

--One library requires that all librarians have the MLS. There were no exceptions and no further comments, except to say that the current archivist has an MLS; if the archivist did not have the MLS, he/she would theoretically be placed into an administrative rank.

--One library hired a person with an MLS (having advertised that the MLS was required) for a subject specialist position. It was felt that the MLS was essential due to the emphasis placed on reference service in the position. The respondent commented further that only programmer positions currently did not require the MLS, but that one programmer does have the MLS and, most likely, all future programmers will be required to have the MLS. Additionally, the archivist has an MLS, which was a requirement at the time of hiring.

--One library requiring the MLS for appointment into the faculty rank automatically rejects applicants without the MLS or with a non-ALA accredited degree. Specialty positions not requiring the MLS do exist, but appointees are placed in administrative ranks.

--Another library's faculty handbook places all MLS holders into librarian ranks, but identifies certain specialist positions which allow background other than the MLS (e.g., automation, subject specialties, and archives). The faculty system devising these exceptions is new enough that no specialists have as yet been hired subsequent to the creation of the written guidelines. It was assumed by the respondent that such people will be granted faculty status, but in an administrative rank.

--One library requires the MLS for all librarian positions. But,

history was deemed most important for archival positions. Therefore, an archivist without the MLS was hired for the advertised position, but was placed in an administrative rank.

--One library requires the MLS for librarian rank only because the state's certification requirements mandate the MLS. The library's personnel director would prefer not to have the MLS required.

--One library does not require the MLS in all cases. But, due to the controversial nature of attempts to establish absolute guidelines, this library has created a committee on appointment criteria to review and approve requirements for every advertised position on a case-by-case basis. With each opening it is determined, at the beginning of the search process, whether the MLS is required or whether other educational qualifications are more relevant. Theoretically, this system allows for the appointment of non-MLS professionals into the librarian ranks. In actual practice, however, it was stated that few exceptions to the MLS requirement are ever made; these exemptions are archival positions and temporary, grant-funded positions.

--One library advertising for a curator in the Archives Department required the MLS and/or a graduate degree in history. Archives is the only department in which professional librarians (with title and rank) are not required to have the MLS. No objection has been raised by other librarians because, according to the respondent, the librarians recognize the difference in the nature of archival work.

In response to questions 2 and 3--faculty status and rank--the respondents indicated that most librarians within their institutions have faculty status. The difference between "rank" and "status," however, is not always clearly defined. Some libraries grant faculty status only to individuals with the MLS. Of these, some require the MLS for both librarian

and specialist positions within the library. Others will hire specialists into the system, but rank them as administrators without faculty status. Still others distinguish between librarians (with the MLS) and administrative specialists (without the MLS), but grant faculty status to both. How faculty status, then, affects the MLS requirement is not always clear.

With regard to question 4--pool of applicants--not all respondents indicated whether they felt that the pool of applicants was restricted in filling the advertised position by requiring specific educational background. Of those who did respond, some specific cases are worth noting:

--One respondent, advertising for a slide librarian, felt that the pool was much restricted by requiring the MLS; the library hired a candidate with no previous slide library experience.

--Another respondent agreed that the pool is always small, but attributes this primarily to low salaries paid at the particular institution. The MLS is required, but the small pool is not seen as being the result of the MLS requirement.

--One respondent agreed that the pool of applicants for a computer position was limited, but felt that the MLS was crucial, having had previous bad experience with non-MLS computer people.

--Another respondent felt that the current limited pool of computer people with the MLS is temporary; as automation develops, more and more information scientists will possess both computer training and the MLS, and, concurrently, more and more library automation positions will require the MLS.

To summarize the telephone survey, of all nine libraries contacted, not all responded to all questions. One must also bear in mind that the Advisory Council did not intend the telephone survey to be a formal, comprehensive study; rather, the survey was conducted in order to give the Council a general

feeling for the experiences of other large academic libraries which have recently considered the matter of specialists. Responses to the questions indicate that most libraries still require the MLS for appointment as a librarian. For some libraries, faculty status guidelines determine minimum educational qualifications. For one, state certification requirements determine minimum educational qualifications. Some institutions requiring the MLS for all librarian positions still maintain non-MLS librarians, but under grandfather clauses only. There are institutions which make exceptions to the MLS requirement for librarian rank or faculty status only for specialized positions--usually in archives. Any other exceptions to the MLS requirement usually occur at very large institutions with specialized collections and needs. Most respondents did indicate that a hard decision on library specialists is a fairly recent phenomenon. Some are happy with the solutions devised; others are not.

IV. THE ISSUE AS ADDRESSED BY THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

The American Library Association established a Minimum Qualifications for Librarians Task Force in 1978. Its charge is to study the competencies needed for entry level professional positions; possible alternative routes (other than formal education) to professional positions; and the impact of Equal Employment Opportunity laws on the MLS (or its variant designations) as a minimum educational requirement for librarian positions.

The Task Force has produced a fact sheet entitled "Minimum Qualifications for Librarians: What are the Issues?" (see Bibliography) which offers advice to libraries facing the issue of minimum requirements. As the authors of this publication observe, "ALA policy presently states that a Master's degree (i.e., the MLS or its variant designations) is the basic requirement for librarian positions." Furthermore, "until examinations are identified that are valid and reliable tests of equivalent qualifications, the academic degree (or evidence of years of academic work completed) is recommended as the single best means for determining that an applicant has the background recommended."

As the authors note, however, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) guidelines may affect the use of the MLS requirement in the hiring process. Further, there have been several cases which challenge the MLS requirement. In some, such as the March 1979 case brought before the Jacksonville, Florida Civil Service Board Classification Committee, the MLS has been upheld as a minimum requirement for librarian employment. In others, such as the classification system adopted by the Ohio Civil Service Commission, the MLS has been dropped as a minimum requirement.

While the Task Force is still exploring the issue of minimum employment qualifications, it does make specific recommendations for the interim.

Specifically, it recommends that "selection procedures be carefully validated to ensure that the applicants possess the necessary competencies. Because professional validation is a highly technical, expensive and time-consuming procedure, alternative qualifications should not be established arbitrarily or hastily."

Although the work of the Task Force focuses primarily on the issue of whether the MLS as a minimum requirement for employment can justifiably withstand the challenge of job seekers with skills acquired in ways other than coursework or degrees, it is nonetheless relevant to the issue of MLS equivalency at the University of Connecticut Libraries. When the MLS itself has not been formally validated, it would indeed seem rash to install locally a series of additional degrees (to the exclusion of others) which would also be unvalidated at this time.

Eleanor Holmes Norton, former chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, addressed this issue of validation at the annual American Library Association meeting in Philadelphia in 1982. The Office for Library Personnel Resources Advisory Committee sponsored a program entitled "Just What Does a Librarian Do? Techniques for Raising Awareness," which was devoted to the issues of minimum qualifications and comparable pay. Ms. Holmes pointed out that under the EEOC Uniform Guidelines, an employer must show that degree requirements are job-related and that a single definitive court suit could dismember credentialism for the MLS degree unless the profession takes steps to validate the degree. She stressed that this did not mean an abandonment of professional standards and that standards which have been validated will not be dismissed by the courts. She emphasized that alternative routes to the profession should be established, validated, and evaluated, but that such routes for librarians have not yet been established and that such validation

and evaluation procedures are difficult to put in place.[5]

[5]Regarding the issue of validation, the US Department of Education has engaged King Research, Inc. "to determine the present and future competencies needed by library and information science professionals and to examine the education needed to achieve those capabilities." King Research is to "establish a planning process to identify, define, describe, and validate library competencies, and design and implement appropriate curricula." (American Libraries 13 (December 1982): 678).

V. SUMMARY OF THE MEETING WITH THE UNIVERSITY ARCHIVIST

In response to the University Archivist's memorandum of February 26, 1982 (Appendix A), the Advisory Council met with the Archivist on July 21, 1982. The meeting consisted of a brief presentation by the University Archivist which focused on his desire to eliminate the MLS as the minimum educational requirement for Librarian I in Historical Manuscripts & Archives and to substitute instead a graduate degree in history, American studies, or archival administration; his presentation was followed by a lengthy question and answer period.

In his presentation, the University Archivist relied on his February 26 memorandum to represent the major reasons why he feels the above changes should be made. In addition, he noted one event since February which, in his view, strengthens the justification for his request. Under the University of Connecticut Professional Employees Association (UCPEA) contract for July 1, 1982-June 30, 1985, all promotions for members of the bargaining unit will be accompanied by a minimum raise of $250. Since the University Archivist is a University Library Specialist and since there are no ranks in this category, he cannot be promoted and hence cannot receive a promotional raise; likewise, since another professional in Historical Manuscripts & Archives was hired as a University Library Assistant (ULA) III and since ULA III is the top rank for the ULA category, she could not be promoted and hence could not receive a promotional raise.

The University Archivist then focused on a question which he feels is basic to the issue of accepting other graduate degrees as equivalent to the MLS: What constitutes professional status or professional qualifications in a particular field? In library science, it is clearly the MLS degree; in the archival profession, the answer is less easily defined. Traditionally,

archivists have come from the historian ranks. In the last twenty to thirty years, a path has also developed through education in library science, primarily because archives have often--but not exclusively--been tied to library systems. Currently, the archival profession is moving in yet a third direction for training--archival education programs, which afford greater autonomy from both history and library science alike. The University Archivist feels, however, that solid background, training, and experience in historical research still constitute the essential route for archival training.

In spite of the fact that the University Archivist sees archival work as different from library science and sees the education and training for the two professions as different, he stated in his presentation that because of mutual institutional connections, archivists should be recognized as being in many other respects the same as librarians. And, when it becomes an issue of status within the library system, the two professions should be treated as equal. The archivist continued by stating that use of the University Library Specialist category for archivists is akin to setting up an "other" category, which, while being a professional category, is inherently not equal to the "main," i.e., University Librarian, category. Use of the University Library Assistant III rank for archivists is also unsatisfactory; not only is it a dead end as far as promotions are concerned, but ULAs, in practice, are not considered fully professional in the same way that University Librarians or University Library Specialists are.

After the University Archivist's presentation, a wide-ranging question and answer period took place. From the discussion, the reasons for the University Archivist's proposal to change the educational requirements for University Librarian I in Historical Manuscripts & Archives became clearer. His concern focused less on his own status as a University Library Specialist

than on the status of one of his employees as a ULA III. At the time this employee was hired in Historical Manuscripts & Archives, the only category open to her was that of University Library Assistant, since appointment to the University Librarian ranks requires an MLS degree and appointment to the University Library Specialist rank was apparently reserved, at the time, for those possessing the PhD. The newly hired employee met neither of these educational requirements but possessed, rather, a master's degree in American studies and one and a half years of archival experience. Thus, the rank of University Library Assistant III was used for the position. As the University Archivist noted, however, one should not hire individuals at the highest level it is possible for them to attain, especially for an entry level position. The situation seemed all the more unjust to the University Archivist given the fact that the second choice candidate for the position would, because he had the MLS, have been hired as a University Librarian I or II--a rank ostensibly carrying more status than that of University Library Assistant III. In the University Archivist's view, the final injustice occurred when the newly appointed Preservation Officer was given the rank of University Library Specialist. The significance of this is that, for the first time, the University Library Specialist category was used for someone without the PhD. Thus, a solution that was unavailable for the archives position was, several months later, available in another case. [This particular situation has since been changed; the ULA III was recently upgraded to a University Library Specialist].

The University Archivist also identified several more general concerns regarding the use of separate ranks for archivists and librarians. Perhaps central to his argument that the educational requirement for the University Librarian ranks be modified is the issue of perception--specifically, recognition and status. In his view, archivists are seen by librarians as different

and therefore somehow less closely tied to librarians and less respected. He observed that, in any professional organization, the status which is most clearly recognized is that of the profession itself, and to be put in a separate category is unnecessary and a further way of isolating those people who do not have that particular professional degree from those who do. In addition to the issues of status and esteem, the University Archivist focused on the issue of building communication within the University of Connecticut Library. Assuming that common rank would lead to more contact, professional exchange, peer review, etc., the University Archivist said that archivists would learn more about library functions.

Another issue of importance to the University Archivist concerns the Library's ability to attract well-qualified people for positions and the fact that requiring an MLS for appointment to the University Librarian ranks may be a restrictive practice. The issue of unduly restricting the applicant pool will be discussed in Section VIII. It should be noted, however, that while the University Archivist may see the MLS requirement as unduly restrictive, at the same time he would not hire an MLS holder as an archivist unless he/she also had historical research experience and/or archival training. In fact, he observed that Yale's Manuscripts and Archives Department requires an advanced degree in history for appointment as a librarian and that a master's degree in any other subject, including library science, is not a valid substitute. Regarding the requirement, he observed, "That's the kind of policy that I'd be very glad to live with for this department."

VI. SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS FROM UNIVERSITY LIBRARIANS

On July 6, 1982, the Advisory Council sent a memo. ndum to all University of Connecticut librarians concerning the present requirement of the MLS for appointment to the librarian ranks (see Appendix E). In addition to announcing the date for an all-librarian meeting on the subject, the memo solicited written commentary from librarians. Ten responses were received by the August 25 meeting, with one additional response arriving a day later. The response rate, given a mailing to 52 librarians, was 21%--or 26%, if the nine Advisory Council members are excluded as likely respondents. A summary of the written commentary follows.

If one common thread can be found in the written responses, it is that the librarians were clearly opposed to rewriting the Criteria for Appointment and Promotion in order to allow for substitution of other degrees or experience for the MLS. Perhaps the most frequent reason offered is that the program of studies leading to the MLS provides an overall library philosophy and overview of library operations that a subject degree and/or job experience in one particular area of librarianship cannot. As one respondent stated, "Library schools provide their graduates not only with specific training in library skills, but most important of all, with an overall professional library philosophy and a general awareness of library operations. A subject specialist without the MLS degree may be extremely knowledgeable in one special area, but will lack that essential total involvement in and overall view of library service." A second reason frequently offered as support for the MLS requirement is that the degree represents a commitment to the profession of librarianship. As one librarian with a subject specialty notes, "It [the MLS] represents a professional commitment on the part of the librarian--a long-term commitment to service and to the field. Those who have a PhD . . .

but who lack formal training in library science may be extremely knowledgeable in their area(s) of specialty . . . but may lack an overall view of the needs of the community and may not be committed to a long-term, low-paying career of service." Finally, several respondents commented on the need for even more extensive on-the-job training that an influx of subject specialists without the MLS would create; this training would encompass areas such as basic cataloging principles, general reference, etc.--areas that would be covered in a library school curriculum but obviously not in the subject-oriented curriculum of the specialist.

Aside from the more general observations contained above, the written commentary also focused on the inequities that would occur in this library should a subject degree or other specialized training be accepted as equivalent to the MLS. First, several respondents noted that it would be unfair to accept the previous experience or non-degree specialized training of a specialist when this has not been allowed for librarians. Would there be an equal commitment to re-examining all those now in the librarian ranks as to relevant pre-MLS library experience and added degrees in relevant subject areas or languages in order to properly and fully adjust the ranks? A second area for potential inequity concerns those University Library Assistants, past and present, in positions that could also be filled by a librarian, e.g., Head of Technical Processing Unit, Head of Serials, Curator of the Alternative Press Collection, etc. Would it be fair to exclude them from the University Librarian ranks because they lack the MLS, when a subject specialist without the MLS would be included in those same ranks? Finally, one respondent mentioned what is perceived as a third potential inequity: There have been instances in which a University Library Assistant has been hired who already possesses the MLS degree, but who is not allowed into the University Librarian ranks.

In addition to the problem areas outlined above, respondents also identified two factors which might make any alteration in the present absolute requirement of an MLS undesirable for the present time. First, several respondents mentioned the job classification study that is currently being conducted by the University; until the results of this study are known, any radical change in educational requirements for specific ranks would be precipitous. Secondly, at a time when the entire library profession is engaged in the issue of educational requirements for librarianship, it seems unwise for libraries to confuse the issue further with a series of separate local decisions leading to yet more diverse standards.

Some respondents acknowledged that there could be advantages to eliminating the present absolute requirement of an MLS for appointment as a University Librarian. Elimination of the requirement might make it easier to meet Equal Employment Opportunity Commission guidelines, would provide administrative flexibility in making appointments, and would open up the career ladder for non-MLS professionals in the Library. The same respondents who noted these advantages, however, felt that they were not sufficient reasons for dropping the MLS as a minimum requirement. A frequently mentioned solution to the specific problem of a lack of a career ladder for non-MLS specialists was to endow the University Library Specialist category with ranks similar to those used for University Librarians. This would promote not only a sense of advancement in rank through promotions but would also mean that Library Specialists would be eligible for promotional raises as stipulated by the University of Connecticut Professional Employees Association contract for 1982-1985.

VII. SUMMARY OF THE ALL-LIBRARIAN MEETING

On August 25, 1982, the Advisory Council held an all-librarian meeting in order to describe its progress with the MLS equivalency issue and to provide an additional opportunity for librarians to offer their comments on the issue. The commentary ACEP received was wide-ranging and generally supported the viewpoints expressed in the written commentary. Notably, there were several librarians at the meeting who had attained their MLS degree--in some cases with reservations--while working at the University of Connecticut Library. Invariably, they stated that the coursework towards the MLS provided them with a comprehensive knowledge of library operations that they could not have obtained through their jobs alone. A listing of additional points which were raised follows.

Further problem areas for consideration:

1. An additional precipitating factor for the issue of equivalent degrees at the University of Connecticut Libraries is the fact that many personnel decisions have been based on the educational background and qualifications of individuals, rather than according to the requirements of the position.

2. The issue of minimum educational qualifications for University Librarians at the University of Connecticut has surfaced largely because of the vagueness surrounding the University Library Specialist category. Several librarians urged that the University Librarian develop written guidelines for the use of the Library Specialist designation. (The University Librarian drew up a brief memo on September 8, 1982 outlining criteria for appointment to University Library Specialist positions; see Appendix G).

3. While it is true that those in the University Library Specialist category are indeed denied the opportunity for promotion and for promotional

raises mandated by the 1982-85 UCPEA contract, many University Library Assistants find themselves in a similar situation, in that the career ladder for this category is very short (i.e., only three ranks). Further, some librarians at the meeting felt that the issue of promotional salary increments was not a legitimate reason for changing the criteria for appointment to University Librarian ranks and that the salary problems of those now in the University Library Specialist rank should be dealt with in a different manner.

4. Broadening the minimum educational requirements for the librarian ranks out of fear of discrimination challenges is inappropriate and may result in criteria that are actually less defensible than those by which we now operate. If we were to broaden the minimum educational requirement to several degrees and/or specialized training, we would open ourselves to challenges by still other subject specialists and would be hard pressed to explain what background is necessary in order to function as a librarian.

Other options for solution of problems relating to the University Library Specialist category offered by the librarians present:

1. Adopt a two-track system such as that at the New York Public Library. Equal pay and equal status would result for MLS and non-MLS professionals, but they would occupy two separate career tracks.

2. Place those now in the University Library Specialist rank in the ranks of University Staff Professional I-VI, since this would provide a career ladder. The University Librarian verified that this is indeed an option but that it had not been explored yet.

3. Retain the University Library Specialist category but modify it by the addition of ranks so that promotions would be possible in title and in salary.

4. Open the University Librarian peer review process, as governed by the Criteria for Appointment and Promotion, to the University Library Specialists, but refrain from actually placing them in the University Librarian ranks. This

suggestion generated much discussion with regard to the ability of librarians to evaluate specialists.

5. Refrain from making any changes that would affect the Library Specialists until the results of the University's job classification study are unveiled, since the study itself may result in the provision of career ladders for those currently without them. (It may, of course, result in even broader changes).

Problems and trends in the profession:

1. Specialist categories have arisen in libraries because library schools have not provided training for certain specialized library positions. Library schools should be made aware that they are not doing their job adequately.

2. Some library schools (UCLA, University of Chicago) are developing goals, with Council on Library Resources support, to establish training programs for specialized research library positions.

3. The American Library Association has set up the Minimum Qualifications for Librarians Task Force to explore the issue of minimum educational requirements. Again, several librarians urged that it would be wise to wait for the results of the Task Force's work before acting at the local level.

Procedures for further work on the issue:

1. The results of the Advisory Council's inquiry into the issue of minimum educational requirements for librarian positions and its resulting recommendations will not only be relayed to the University Librarian, but will be made available to the Library staff.

2. If the Advisory Council advocates any changes or amendments to the present educational requirements for University Librarians, these proposed changes must be voted on by the University Librarians and, to be approved, must be endorsed by the majority of the librarians voting, as per the criteria.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

A. Recommendations

1. The Advisory Council on Evaluation and Promotion recommends that the present absolute requirement of an MLS degree as a criterion for appointment to or promotion within the University Librarian ranks be retained.

2. The Advisory Council on Evaluation and Promotion recognizes that there may be, now or in the future, positions and departments within the Library in which the duties and responsibilities of University Library Specialists are similar to those of University Librarians. The Council concludes, however, that the MLS is a necessary educational requirement for appointment as a University Librarian and that an advanced subject degree or specialized training is not an acceptable substitute for appointment to that rank.

3. The Advisory Council on Evaluation and Promotion concludes that the pool of applicants for certain specialized positions will not be unduly restricted by requiring the MLS in addition to a subject master's or specialized training. Further, for these positions the Council believes that requiring the MLS in addition to a subject master's or specialized training can only benefit the quality of service rendered to the Library and recommends to the Library Administration that it fill present or anticipated specialist vacancies with candidates possessing such credentials.

4. The Advisory Council on Evaluation and Promotion recommends that the Library Administration cease using the University Library Specialist classification on an *ad hoc* basis and formulate detailed and justifiable guidelines for appointment to that rank.

B. Narrative

In reaching its recommendations, the Advisory Council has considered the following points:

--The specific issue of MLS equivalency at the University of Connecticut has arisen because of the use of the University Library Specialist category on an ad hoc basis, resulting in certain inequities.

These inequities include, first, the inconsistent and sometimes unfair use of the University Library Specialist category. As noted in Section V, not only have the "criteria" for inclusion in the Library Specialist rank changed seemingly at whim--indeed, they did not exist in writing until September 8, 1982--but there has been one instance in which one employee (the Preservation Officer) was placed in that rank while another employee (an archivist) with comparable educational credentials was excluded. Although this particular instance of inequity has since been remedied, the fact remains that such ad hoc arrangements frequently result in inconsistency and inequity.

The second inequity resulting from the present structure of the University Library Specialist rank is the unavailability to Library Specialists of the same or a similar career ladder available to those within the University Librarian ranks. Previously, this inequity was reflected in title only; now, however, it is reflected in a lack of access to the promotional raises provided under the University of Connecticut Professional Employees Association 1982-1985 contract. Clearly, this issue must be addressed by the Library Administration.

The use of the University Library Specialist category on an ad hoc basis has resulted in a third inequity: a perceived isolation by some occupying this rank from the University Librarians and the Library. This, it must be stressed, is a perception. Further, whether it would exist were the Library Specialist rank used in a more consistent, justified, and positive manner is obviously yet to be determined.

--To alter the minimum educational requirement for appointment to the University Librarian ranks in order to identify certain positions and/or departments in which certain subject degrees and/or specialized training would be accepted in lieu of

the MLS would wreak havoc with a well-functioning system.

At the University of Connecticut Library, the evolution of the criteria for appointment to--and promotion within--the librarian ranks has taken place over a long period of time. It has resulted in an orderly, well-defined procedure. It is a system in which those involved know what is expected of them. Putting such a personnel system in place is always a difficult matter; to impose order upon past policies and practices inevitably results in inequities for some, which diminish with time. To tamper with such a system will lead to renewed inequities and to another long period of uncertainty.

--If one were to accept equivalent experience and/or specialized training for non-MLS specialists to be appointed to the University Librarian ranks, greater inequities than now exist would result.

Under the present system, University Librarians are not given employment and rank status credit for their pre-professional library experience or other relevant experience. However, under the proposal to change the present criteria, non-MLS holders would be given exactly that--credit for their equivalent experience--in order to attain the University Librarian ranks. If this proposed change were instituted, all those in the present University Librarian ranks would have to be reevaluated to consider the pre-professional or equivalent experience they had at the time of appointment. Otherwise, the majority--if not all--of those librarians with the MLS would be in inequitable situations vis-a-vis those appointed to the University Librarian ranks without the MLS.

--By its very nature, the MLS provides its holder with a requisite overview of library operations that other specialized degrees or training cannot.

The MLS gives its holder an overview of all library operations, not just of the specialized area in which someone may hold an advanced degree or specialized training. This overview may, indeed, not be necessary for some

positions, but in other positions it is essential (e.g., systems) in order to perform competently the duties required of the position. The MLS, though varying in quality and training according to the conferring institution, does provide all holders with an overview of all library operations and a common base of knowledge and expertise amongst co-workers.

> --Any decision the University of Connecticut Library might make to hire a non-MLS holder as a University Librarian will, in essence, be an ad hoc decision.

The University of Connecticut Library has a past practice of making ad hoc decisions relative to appointment to University Library Specialist positions. Rather than immediately change the present criteria for appointment to the University Librarian ranks, the Library should wait to see whether the American Library Association defines alternative career routes to librarianship. The issue of minimum qualifications and equivalencies depends on establishing viable and verifiable alternative career routes to those positions to which the MLS route normally leads. No such definitive alternative career routes have yet been established within the library profession. While it is true that disparities regarding minimum qualifications now exist from library to library, those institutions allowing the most latitude are those few institutions with unique and diversified collections, such as Harvard, Yale, Columbia, etc. The University of Connecticut is not in that category, and the solutions to the personnel issue at hand should not be sought in the policies and practices of larger--indeed unique--institutions.

> --The MLS degree is evidence of an individual's commitment to the profession of librarianship and is still, in most institutions, necessary for the practice of librarianship.

Experience alone is frequently not transferable from one situation to another, i.e., from one position to another within a particular library or from one library to another library. The comments at the all-librarian

meeting of those who worked at the University of Connecticut Library before obtaining the MLS and the different perspective they brought to their jobs after they received the MLS should be especially noted. Further, it is not fair to confer the rank of librarian upon the non-MLS holder who will not be able to transfer that rank to another library which demands the MLS degree.

> --Although the professional literature of librarianship is replete with criticism of the MLS and its relevance to professional library work, this literature offers few well-reasoned, viable, and defensible alternatives for the education of librarians.

It is evident in the discussions of professionalism that librarians have, in many instances, relinquished their right of self-determination and have allowed others to define their tasks as purely technical exercises, able to be performed by anyone with a small amount of technical training and an introduction to library sources. The intellectual content of a librarian's responsibilities, the body of knowledge and background of libraries and library science as taught in library school, and the accompanying exposure to theory and debate of library problems have frequently been buried in a literature which denigrates the role of librarians, yet which offers few alternatives to library school training. It is this lack of suggested alternatives which severely limits the usefulness of the criticisms contained in the professional literature.

Some critics of the MLS have relied heavily on Equal Employment Opportunity guidelines, decisions by several civil service boards, and various studies--especially the Library Selection Project--as evidence for their belief that the MLS cannot and should not be retained as a necessary educational requirement for librarianship. Most disturbing is the fact that these critics seem, without careful reasoning, to conclude that the MLS

could not possibly withstand legal challenges--a conclusion which is not necessarily valid. Surely it would be more productive to examine the MLS carefully and to strengthen or validate it where necessary. Secondly, with regard to the Library Selection Project, critics seem to focus on certain sections of the study in order to bolster their arguments against the MLS while ignoring other sections which might undermine these arguments. These critics also fail to question the underlying notions of the study, its faulty reasoning, the limited participation, inconclusive responses, and possible misinterpretation of federal employment guidelines.

The Advisory Council is aware that its recommendations run counter to the current trend in library literature. The Council found, however, a significant lack of substance in the literature on the subject of minimum educational requirements for librarianship. It is to be hoped that in the next few years the focus and quality of the literature will be different.

C. Conclusion

Having thoroughly considered the issue of establishing an MLS equivalency at the University of Connecticut Libraries, the Advisory Council on Evaluation and Promotion recommends that the MLS be retained as the minimum educational requirement for appointment to or promotion within the University Librarian ranks. During the time that the Council has been researching and discussing the issue, there have been further modifications made to the University Library Specialist category. If the perceived problems which precipitated the issue of equivalent degrees still persist, we urge the Library Administration to explore other avenues for remedying the problems. Until such time as the results of the American Library Association's inquiry into equivalencies are made public and the results of the University's job classification study are known, the Advisory Council will not recommend modification of the minimum educational requirement for the University Librarian ranks.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Library Association. Office for Library Personnel Resources. Minimum Qualifications for Librarians Task Force. Minimum Qualifications For Librarians: What are the Issues? Chicago: ALA/OLPR, May 1980.

"Archives Education Guidelines Approved." Society of American Archivists. Newsletter (May 1977):4-5.

Association of Research Libraries. Office of Management Studies. Systems and Procedures Exchange Center. Specialty Positions in ARL Libraries: Kit 80. Washington, D.C.:ARL, January 1982.

Bayless, Sandy. "Librarianship is a Discipline." Library Journal 102 (Sept. 1, 1977):1715-17.

Benedict, Forest C., and Gherman, Paul M. "Implementing an Integrated Personnel System." Journal of Academic Librarianship 6:4 (1980): 210-14.

Bewley, Lois M. "A Canadian Caution." Library Journal 102 (Sept. 1, 1977): 1727.

Birdsall, William F. "Librarianship, Professionalism, & Social Change." Library Journal 107 (Feb. 1, 1982):223-26.

Boaz, Martha. "Strengthening the Profession: a Plea for National Certification." Wilson Library Bulletin 55 (June 1981):766-67.

Borda, Owen M. "It Takes More Than Credentials." Library Journal 102 (Sept. 1, 1977):1727.

Brubaker, Robert L. "An Administrative Profile of Manuscripts Repositories, Archives, and Special Collections in Colleges and Universities." (Unpublished paper presented at the October 1977 Convention of the Society of American Archivists).

Brubaker, Robert L. "Manuscripts are not Peripheral: Introduction." (Unpublished paper presented to a joint ALA/SAA session of the ALA 1977 Annual Conference).

Burr, Robert L. "Certification and Competence." Library Journal 102 (Sept. 1, 1977):1728-29.

Cameron, Dee Birch. "The Credentials Question: Why We Care." The Journal of Academic Librarianship 5:2 (May 1979):83-85.

Columbia University Libraries. Handbook for Librarians. New York: Columbia University, 1978.

Cottam, Keith M. "Minimum Qualifications." Library Journal 107 (Mar. 1, 1982): 485-86.

Cottam, Keith M. "Minimum Qualifications and the Law: the Issue Ticks Away for Librarians." American Libraries 11 (May 1980):280-81.

Cottam, Keith M. "Professional Specialists in Academic Libraries." ARL Management Supplement 4:1 (June 1976):1-6.

Creth, Sheila, and Harders, Faith. "Requirements for the Entry Level Librarian." Library Journal 105 (Oct. 15, 1980):2168-69.

Daniels, Westwell R. "An Alternative to Library School." Library Journal 103 (Sept. 15, 1978):1702-03.

Dollard, Peter. "Lock the Loonies in a Stereotype!" Library Journal 102 (Sept. 1, 1977):1725-26.

Dowell, David R. "Certification: More Study Needed." Library Journal 102 (Sept. 1, 1977):1720-21.

Dowell, David R., ed. "Minimum Qualifications for Librarians: Papers from a Symposium Sponsored by Office of Library Personnel Resources Advisory Committee at American Library Association Annual Conference, 1978." North Carolina Libraries 38 (Spring 1980):7-29.

"Downgrading of Federal Librarians' Jobs Feared." Library Journal 107 (Feb. 1, 1982):208-09.

Estabrook, Leigh. "Labor & Librarians: the Divisiveness of Professionalism." Library Journal 106 (Jan. 15, 1981):125-27.

Galloway, R. Dean. "Status or Stasis: Academic Librarians 10 Years Later." American Libraries 10 (June 1979):349-52.

Grady, Ruth Ellen. "Library Work without an M.L.S." Library Journal 102 (Sept. 1, 1977):1726.

Harvard University Library. Handbook for Librarians. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Library, 1979.

Hogdin, Ellis. "Orphans without a Home." Library Journal 102 (Sept. 1, 1977): 1722.

Isaacson, David. "Anti-Intellectualism in American Libraries." Library Journal 107 (Feb. 1, 1982):227-32

"Library Lawsuit Centers on Minimum Qualifications." American Libraries 12 (Jul./Aug. 1981):399-400.

Library Selection Project: Job Analysis Report, Phase I. Anthony Gerczak, project director. Sacramento, Calif.: Selection Consulting Center, c1977.

Library Selection Project: Selection Systems Design for Entry-Level Professional Librarians, Phase II. Anthony Gerczak, project director. Sacramento, Calif.: Selection Consulting Center, c1978.

MacCampbell, James C. "Better Utilization of Personnel." Library Journal 102 (Sept. 1, 1977):1718-20.

McCrank, Lawrence. Education for Rare Book Librarianship: a Reexamination of Trends and Problems. Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1980 (Occasional Paper; no. 144).

McCrank, Lawrence J. "Prospects for Integrating Historical and Information Studies in Archival Education." American Archivist 42:4 (Oct. 1979):443-55.

Nelson, Bonnie R. "The Chimera of Professionalism." Library Journal 105 (Oct. 1, 1980):2029-33.

"New Directions for Library Ed." American Libraries 13 (December 1982):678.

"Notes for Notes." Music Library Association Notes 27:4 (June 1971):699-700.

Ochs, Michael. "A Taxonomy of Qualifications for Music Librarianship: the Cognitive Domain." Music Library Association Notes 33:1 (Sept. 1976): 27-44.

Olsgaard, John N., and Olsgaard, Jane Kinch. "Post-MLS Educational Requirements for Academic Librarians." College & Research Libraries 42 (May 1981):224-28.

Peace, Nancy E., and Chudacoff, Nancy Fisher. "Archivists and Librarians: a Common Mission, a Common Education." The American Archivist 42:4 (October 1979):456-62.

"Position Classification at Michigan: Another Look." College & Research Libraries 40:3 (May 1979):205-13.

Princeton University. Office of the Dean of the Faculty. Rules and Procedures of the Professional Library Staff of Princeton University. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University, 1976.

"Qualifications of a Music Librarian: a Report from the Committee on Professional Education of the Music Library Association." College Music Symposium 15 (Spring 1975):87-93.

Reagan, Michael J. "Mandatory Certification -- a Proposal that Lost." Library Journal 102 (Sept. 1, 1977):1723-24.

"Responses to Question 21 in Questionnaire Concerning Administrative Relationships among Manuscripts, Archives, Special Collections, and Similar Units in Colleges and Universities." (Unpublished paper listing responses to questionnaire circulated by a joint ALA/SLA Committee on Archives-Library Relationships at the ALA 1977 Annual Conference).

Ross, Ian. "Library-Archive Relations: the Question of Education." Canadian Library Journal 37 (Feb. 1980):39-44.

Schwartz, Narda L. "The Professional Attitude." Library Journal 102 (Sept. 1, 1977):1729-31.

Swan, John C. "Minimum Qualifications and Intellectual Freedom." Library Journal 106 (Sept. 1, 1981):1595-99.

Toy, Beverly J. "The Role of the Academic Librarian: A Symposium." Journal of Academic Librarianship 4:3 (1978):128-38.

Weichlein, William J. "Training for Music Librarianship." Fontes Artis Musicae 18:1/2 (1971):28-30.

White, Herbert. "Library Education: a Strategy for the Future." Wilson Library Bulletin 56 (Oct. 1981):105-109.

White, Herbert. "Research and Reality: Does Better Mean Longer? Research Needs of the Library Education Process." American Libraries 12 (March 1981):151-152.

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT LIBRARY

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS & ARCHIVES

TO: Norman Stevens
FROM: Randall Jimerson
DATE: February 26, 1982
RE: Requirements for University Librarian Ranks

I hereby request that the minimum educational requirement for the rank of University Librarian I in Historical Manuscripts & Archives be set as "completion of an accredited graduate program in History, American Studies, or Archival Administration.".

When this department conducted a search for a professional archivist in 1981, I asked you to explore the possibility of making the appointment at the rank of University Librarian I or II, as would be done for other library positions requiring a graduate degree. Because the position did not require a degree in "librarianship or information science," and the successful candidate did not have such a degree, we were forced to hire a professional archivist under the rank heading "University Library Assistant III."

I would like to request a careful review of this requirement that University Librarian I candidates be considered solely on the basis of having a degree in "librarianship." Professional positions in this department require highly specialized subject expertise in order to evaluate, organize, and provide reference service for archival materials. Archival materials are entirely different from library materials and require unique treatment. The M.L.S. degree is neither necessary nor appropriate, unless accompanied by specifid archival study and advanced study of History. Increasingly, libraries -- including, among many others, Yale and Michigan -- are recognizing this distinction and opening the librarian ranks to archivists and others who have the appropriate professional education in their fields.

Professional staff members in Historical Manuscripts & Archives should not be treated as "second class citizens" because their graduate training does not fall within the narrow constraints on Library Science. This requirement is particularly objectionable because there is no possibility for promotion beyond the rank of ULA III. We are thus forced to hire young (or older), energetic professional archivists into a dead end job classification. This is likely to have a detrimental effect on our future ability to attract and keep the best possible candidates for archival positions.

In light of this, I strongly urge a full review of this requirement by the Advisory Council on Evaluation and Promotion in the coming months. At the very least, I should be allowed to argue the merits of this case before my peers. I would hope that you will recommend such a review.

cc. Ellen Embardo, ACEP

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT LIBRARY

March 17, 1982

Ms. Marie Clark
Government Publications Department
University Library

Dear Marie:

This letter is intended to attempt to clarify the issue relating to the criteria for appointment to or promotion within the University Librarian ranks in respect to the present absolute requirement of a MLS degree. Let me emphasize that I fully endorse the role of the present staff in those ranks and the Advisory Council in establishing criteria subject to administrative review and approval within the University Library and the University. While I do have a particular view on the issue, which I will be happy to share with the Council at a later date, my primary intention at this point is simply to attempt to identify more clearly the issues which I feel the Council should address.

In a broader sense the whole issue of equivalency based on work experience and of minimum qualifications for appointment to the University Librarian ranks probably should be addressed at some point. As you examine the literature I am sure that you will find considerable discussion of that point. Many of the questions raised by those issues relate to affirmative action and equal opportunity and it may well be that we will need to consider those issues at some point. But for the present, at least, the issue is a somewhat narrower one.

Specifically the question is whether or not there are, or may be, positions within the University Libraries whose duties and responsibilities are such that they are in accord with the qualities desired in librarians of all ranks and those specifically delineated for the various ranks, beginning with that of University Librarian I, but for which other educational qualifications might be substituted for the present minimum educational requirement of completion of an accredited graduate program in librarianship or information science.

Without attempting to suggest new or alternative language let me at least support the particular problems that should be considered.

(1) Are there departments within the library where duties are such that they meet the other criteria in all respects but for which a master's degree in a subject field, or other specialized training, could be accepted as the equivalent of the MLS?

(2) Are there specific jobs, within the University Library, either presently established or contemplated, in which the assignments are such that they again fully meet all other criteria but for which a master's degree in a subject field, or other specialized training, could be accepted as the equivalent of the MLS?

(3) Without assuming that in any and every case a master's degree in a subject field would be accepted as the equivalent of an MLS can a distinction be made, on the basis of the job assignment or the department, between those cases where such a degree, or specialized training, can be accepted as a valid equivalent?

(4) Will the pool of potential applicants for certain kinds of positions, or in certain departments, be unduly restricted if we require an MLS in addition to a subject master's degree, or specialized training?

(5) If consideration is to be given to accepting a subject master's degree, or specialized training, as the equivalent of the MLS in certain departments or for certain positions, can a particular degree, or degrees, or a particular kind of specialized training, be clearly identified as an appropriate criteria?

(6) Can the entire matter be described and defined clearly enough so that if in certain departments or for certain positions an equivalency is established, a situation is not created in which questions and issues about the appropriateness of other degrees or experience for other positions are raised?

(7) Can the matter be described accurately and adequately enough in the criteria so that decisions are automatic and well understood rather than having to be reached on an ad hoc basis?

Please let me know if I can do anything more to clarify (or confuse) the issue.

Sincerely,

Norman D. Stevens

Norman D. Stevens
University Librarian

NDS:sm

Appendix C

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT LIBRARY
APRIL 8, 1982

TO: All professional librarians

FROM: Advisory Council on Evaluation and Promotion of Professional Librarians (1981-1982)

SUBJECT: April 13, 1982 meeting agenda

Dear Colleagues:

Here is the proposed agenda for the April 13, all-librarian meeting beginning 9:30 a.m. (refreshments at 9:15) in the Library Seminar Room, P-108.

I: Report of this year's Council work not requiring changes in the P.S.R. form or Criteria. Estimated time: 20-30 minutes)

A. history of ACEP meeting (Feb.) with Richard Schimmelpfeng, Mary Thatcher, Marian Rollin, Joan Jensen & this year's Council, discussing:
   1. background to formation of ACEP
   2. role of ACEP
   3. parallel structure of ACEP recommendations reaching Norman Stavens at the same time as departmental recommendations
   4. role of personal knowledge in promotional deliberations

B. ACEP notebook & disposition of ACEP files

C. number of candidates this year, including one "speeded-up" promotion last summer

D. UCPEA letter - ragarding promotional raises

E. review of Library administrators

F. disposition of promotional files

II. Changes in P.S.R. & Criteria. Estimated time: 1¼ hour. Please see previous mailing

III. Specialists & M.L.S. equivalency. Estimated time: 20-30 minutes.

Should the meeting take longer than the allotted two hours, it may be necessary to schedule an additional meeting, rather than extending the meeting much beyond 11:30.

See you all on Tuesday.

14 Sincerely,

viii Ellen E. Embardo

Ellen E. Embardo,
Chair

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT LIBRARY

May 18, 1982

Mr. Norman D. Stevens
University Librarian
University Library

Dear Mr. Stevens:

This is in response to your letter of March 17, 1982 to the Advisory Council on Evaluation and Promotion and to previous discussions you have had with the Council regarding the criteria for appointment to or promotion within the University Librarian ranks in respect to the present absolute requirement of an MLS degree.

As you are aware, at the April 13 ACEP annual meeting with the professional librarians, it was the conclusion of those present that ACEP should make such a recommendation to you after ACEP has discussed the issue with the professional librarians on the staff. Since the present Council expires at the end of May, those on the Council felt such a recommendation should be postponed until the new Council, which convenes in June, has had sufficient time to thoroughly explore the issue. Present Council members who will continue to serve on the next Council anticipate that a recommendation either to change, or not to change, the present criteria requiring an MLS degree for the Librarian ranks should be forthcoming to you from the Council by the end of September 1982. This should give all new Council members ample time to acquaint themselves with the issue and to solicit input and discussion from Library staff.

If you anticipate any problems with this time-table, or should you have additional information or comments you wish to share with the Council regarding this issue, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Ellen E. Embardo

Ellen E. Embardo, Chair
Advisory Council on Evaluation
and Promotion

cc: Randall Jimerson
Historical Manuscripts and Archives

Appendix E

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT LIBRARY

July 6, 1982

TO: All Professional Librarians

FROM: Pamela A. Skinner PAS
Chair, Advisory Council on Evaluation and Promotion

SUBJECT: Present absolute requirement of an MLS degree for appointment to University Librarian ranks

In 1980-1981 and in 1981-1982, the Advisory Council on Evaluation and Promotion has been requested by Norman Stevens, the University Librarian, to address the issue of whether or not the present criteria, which require an MLS degree for appointment to the Librarian ranks, should be changed to allow the substitution of other educational qualifications (an "MLS equivalency") for appointment to those ranks. Since this issue addresses major policy and personnel practices within this Library, it is obviously not an issue that should be decided, case by case, on an ad hoc basis. Accordingly, for the past two years, Mr. Stevens has sought the Council's advice and recommendations, not on the particular cases at hand, but on the broader issue of whether, within the University Libraries, other educational qualifications—such as a master's degree in a subject field or other specialized training—can be accepted as the equivalent of the MLS in appointment to the University Librarian ranks.

The Advisory Council which concluded its tenure on May 31, 1982 began discussions of this matter in early March 1982 preparatory to forwarding to Mr. Stevens their recommendations. That Council felt that it would not have sufficient time to thoroughly explore the issue and charged the new Council, commencing June 1, 1982, to continue its discussions and to forward its recommendations to Mr. Stevens by September 30, 1982.

The Council is obviously aware that its recommendations will affect all University Librarians within the University of Connecticut Libraries. The Council is also aware that the issue of the MLS equivalency is one that is not confined exclusively to this library system but is an issue of concern and discussion within the library profession generally.

Therefore, the Council is asking that all interested University Librarians forward to the Council their written opinions on this issue. The Council would appreciate receipt of these written comments (addressed to myself, Reference Department, U-5R) by July 21, 1982 (excepting vacationing staff, who should forward their responses as soon as possible after that deadline). ACEP will then hold a meeting of all professional librarians to discuss these comments and other matters pertaining to the issue at hand on Wednesday, July 28 in the Conference Room (Administrative Offices) at 1:30-3:30 p.m.

To inform itself more thoroughly about the issue of the MLS requirement vs. the MLS equivalency, and to aid other professional librarians in the Library to inform themselves of the issue, the Council:

1) has collected pertinent professional literature on the topic and has placed this material on reserve in the University Library. (Librarians are encouraged to contribute other relevant materials to ACEP for inclusion). A representative sampling of this literature is being sent to each of the Regional Campus and Professional School libraries.

2) is surveying job listings for librarians in the professional literature--American Libraries, Library Journal, The Chronicle of Higher Education, and College and Research Libraries News--to collect data on those libraries requiring an MLS and those accepting an MLS equivalency.

3) will be contacting particular libraries by telephone and by letter in order to assess the viability of various personnel policies and "MLS required" vs. "MLS equivalency" criteria.

All professional librarians are strongly urged to read the materials available on reserve prior to the July 28 meeting. Appended to this memo is a copy of a letter from Mr. Stevens to the Council so that all librarians can be aware of the issues and questions the Council must address in its recommendations to Mr. Stevens.

attachment
cc: N. Stevens

Appendix F

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT LIBRARY

July 22, 1982

TO: All Professional Librarians

FROM: Pamela A. Skinner PAS
Chair, Advisory Council on Evaluation and Promotion

SUBJECT: Postponement of the July 28, 1982 meeting on the present absolute requirement of an MLS degree for appointment to University Librarian ranks

Due to unavoidable circumstances, the meeting scheduled for July 28, 1:30-3:30 on the MLS equivalency issue must be postponed until a later date. The new date: Wednesday, August 25, 10:00-12:00 a.m., in the Conference Room (Administrative Offices). Since the meeting will not take place for another month and since very few written comments have been received to date, we are also extending the deadline for written comment to August 20.

We very much regret any inconvenience this postponement of the meeting may cause and hope you will be able to attend on the new date.

attachment: suggested reading—"Minimum Qualifications for Librarians: What are the Issues?"

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY SPECIALIST

September 8, 1982

The rank of University Library Specialist is currently used for those positions for which an M.A., Ph.D., or other specialized training of a formal nature directly relevant to a position, is specifically required and is essential to the performance of the duties assigned to that position.

Norman D. Stevens
University Librarian

NDS:cbr